

Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1864

Weekly National Intelligencer.

By GALE & SEATON.

JAMES C. WELLING, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.
The subscription price of this paper for a year is Two Dollars, payable in advance.

A reduction of 20 per cent. (one-fifth of the full charge) will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 25 per cent. (one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who will order and pay for, at one time, twenty or more copies.

No accounts being kept for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1864.

THEORY OF JOURNALISM.

The Philadelphia Age, a Democratic journal, after referring in terms of commendation to a recent article which appeared in our paper, proceeds to say:

"As coming from the quarter it does, it should be most impressive. The Intelligencer can hardly be called an opposition paper. It is one of the 'papers by authority' of the Federal statistics. It has from time to time spoken as if from official inspiration, and certainly has never indulged in any strain of harsh criticism on the doings or shortcomings of the Administration. Regret has indeed been often felt and expressed that, with its conservative tendencies and known regard for the obligations of law, the Intelligencer so often should have even seemed to connive at acts which were confessedly in violation of the law, and had no word of condemnation for the long category of wrongs that have been perpetrated. Therefore it is that, when its editors speak such words of earnest reprehension as we to-day reprint, they should be, and, we faintly hope, will be heard."

The conductors of our Philadelphia Democratic contemporary must be little familiar with the past history of the National Intelligencer, and must have read its columns to little purpose, if they suppose that our relations to the present Administration differ at all from those which we have borne to its predecessors of whatever party. We have never waged a systematic opposition to any Administration with which we have been coeval, however much, on general grounds, we may have been opposed to its political creed, and just as little have we pledged an unquestioning support to any Administration, even when the party with which we most sympathized has been in power and place.

It has so happened, that in the division of parties which has obtained in the country for the last thirty or forty years, we have generally found ourselves in opposition to the reigning Administration, because, during this period, the political power has for the most part been in the hands of the Democratic party, and we were not able to concur in the wisdom or policy of those distinctive measures to which this party was once addicted by its political principles and traditions. But when the measures of this party commended themselves to our judgment, or when its incumbents in office discharged their duties with fidelity and skill, we never felt it just to withhold from the one our support or from the other our humble tribute of praise.

We see no reason for departing from this course in prescribing to ourselves the relations we bear to the present Administration. As candid journalists we feel it our duty to sustain the Administration in all its measures and in all its departments, so far as they commend themselves to our approval. And as independent journalists, called to consult, according to the light before us, the best interests of the Republic rather than the wishes or feelings of men in place, we feel it equally our duty to oppose all measures which we deem unconstitutional or inexpedient, and to animadvert on official negligence and incompetence wherever their presence is a source of weakness or danger to the common weal.

We are well aware that in pursuing this course we can assure for ourselves no exemption from the infirmities which pertain to all human judgments and opinions, but as we always seek to base our approval of measures or our dissent from measures on grounds stated with equal frankness in either case, we hope we generally succeed in impressing on our readers a confidence in the honesty of our motives, even when, as we know must often be the fact, we do not succeed in carrying conviction to every mind with regard to the justice of the grounds on which we base the one or the other. We do not doubt that there are Republican journals which sometimes think we transcend the limits of just criticism in condemning such civil policies and acts of the present Administration as we conceive to be wrong or injudicious, just as the Philadelphia Age makes it appear that there may be Democratic journals which think it just to tax us with "seeming to connive at acts confessedly in violation of law," because, as it ventures to allege, "we have had no word of condemnation for the long category of wrongs that have been perpetrated."

As our consciences do not accuse us of being justly liable to the one or the other of these reproaches, we beg only to say in reply to each that if we have not blamed for the sake of blaming, we have not withheld censure from motives of complacency. We leave to our critics, of whatever party, full privilege to dissent from the theory or practice of our editorial conduct, being content to find in the conflicting grounds of their dissent some reason to hope that we have not fallen entirely below the standard of impartiality which we erect for our guidance.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

A Washington letter to New York states that the public records on Tuesday last show that the public debt outstanding bearing interest in coin is \$883,887,842—a difference less than the amount stated on the 19th instant of \$731,000, the interest being \$32,623,281. The amount of debt bearing interest in lawful money is \$404,550,630, or nearly a million and a half more than in the previous statement, with an aggregate lawful money interest of \$21,027,000. The debt bearing no interest is \$516,732,032. The debt on which interest has ceased is \$370,190. The recapitulation shows the aggregate amount outstanding to be \$1,800,533,535, with interest in gold and lawful money to the amount of \$73,650,630. The principal is \$9,330,000 more than last month's statement. The unpaid requisitions amount to about \$77,000,000, and the amount in the Treasury is nearly \$15,000,000.

THE SIEGE OF WASHINGTON.

We need not direct the attention of our readers to the description of the recent "Siege of Washington," as copied in another part of to-day's paper from the columns of our Republican contemporary, the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat, to which it was contributed by its correspondent "Sidney" in this city. This account is one of the fullest, and at the same time one of the most graphic, which has fallen under our eye, and for its truthfulness none can answer better than our readers in this city, as far as they may have been in a position to verify the observations of the intelligent and sprightly writer.

We have slightly condensed some portions of the narrative, in order to accommodate it to the space we can make available for its insertion in our columns, though in doing so we have been careful not to break the continuity of the epic story as it is evolved in successive acts under the dramatic pen of the narrator.

The "Siege of Washington," we may fondly hope, will live in history and song as long as "the tale of Troy divine," for already the former, though an affair of yesterday, is enveloped in a dim poetic haze which it took ages of antiquity to cast over the siege of Priam's city. With the catalogue of the Greeks, as given by Homer, we can calculate pretty closely how many of these well-greaved warriors sat down for ten years before the walls of Troy, but though our military authorities have, it is said, found the roster of the Southrons lately beleaguering Washington for the space of two summer days and nights, the critical commentators and journalists continue to differ on the question of their number. But as those who are privileged to look through the strongest lenses of the official magnifying glass have gradually reduced their calculations from fifty thousand to thirty-five thousand, and from thirty-five thousand to somewhere "between twenty and thirty thousand," it is hoped that, before the event passes into history, a sufficient approximation to something like the truth on this subject may be reached to prevent a future Niebuhr from relegating the whole story of the "Siege of Washington" to the mythical period of the Republic. If in any mind the swelling scenes of the last week have

"Gone, glimmering through the dream of things that were," the veracious chronicle of "Sidney" will bring them back in all their vividness and in their quick transitions.

NUMBER OF THE INVADERS.

It is known to our readers that the city of Frederick (Md.) was occupied by the Confederate forces under Gen. Early on the 9th instant. The Frederick Examiner of the 30th inst. (a very intense Administration paper) states that the whole number of the invaders is variously estimated in Frederick at from ten to thirty thousand, but the editor dismisses the latter figures as an "exaggeration," and sets down the expedition at about fifteen thousand men. The Maryland "Union," also published in Frederick, states that the invading force "consisted of between ten and fifteen thousand." The whole of this force, whatever it was, whether ten thousand or fifteen thousand, was engaged in the battle of Monocacy, where it lost, the Examiner thinks, in killed, wounded, missing, and disabled, nearly three thousand men—doubtless an over-estimate. After the defeat of General Wallace at Monocacy Junction, several small detachments were sent in the direction of Baltimore to overrun Baltimore county and cut the railroads between Harborsburg and Philadelphia, while the main body of the invaders moved towards Washington and the forts of the Potomac. The reader will readily perceive what entire confirmation is lent by these statements of the Examiner and of the Union to the intelligence, derived from other sources, showing the paucity of the forces which appeared before this city during its recent investment on the north side of the Potomac.

FROM THE ARMY OF THE POTOMAC.

We learn that information has been received from the headquarters of the Army of the Potomac, dated July 25, which says that the shelling and picket firing between the Ninth Corps and the enemy was on Sunday more brisk than usual, and was kept up all day. Very few casualties occur, considering the quantity of powder spent by both parties.

No exchanges of papers have been made between the pickets for some days past, the rebel commanders having strictly prohibited it. A Richmond paper of the 22d claims a decided victory at Atlanta, driving our forces back with tremendous loss. [The official information disclosed by our Government shows that the battle of the 22d (Friday last) was decidedly favorable to the national arms.] The Richmond paper also says that our forces were defeated at Snicker's Gap by Gen. Early, where they took a number of prisoners.

Deserters are not so numerous as they were a week ago, the enemy seeming to keep a strict watch for them along the lines.

A NEW CLASS OF EXEMPTS.

Provost Marshal General Fry has issued a circular to the effect that skilled mechanics and operatives employed in the arsenals and navy yards of the United States, who shall be drafted and on examination be held to service, will not be required to report for duty under such draft, so long as they remain in the aforesaid service, provided the officer in charge shall certify that their labor as mechanics or operatives is necessary for the naval or military service.

VOLUNTEERING.

Authority has been granted to the State authorities by the Secretary of War to organize new regiments of volunteers for one year under the last call for 500,000. The Governor of Ohio has issued his proclamation for twenty new regiments.

General Sherman protests against the entrance of recruiting agents into his department, claiming that they will swell the number of idle non-combatants without rendering any commensurate service.

FIRE AT PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA, JULY 22.—The Government wagon factory of Henry Simmons took fire at eight o'clock to-night, and will probably be entirely consumed. It is the largest establishment of the kind in the country.

GRAND FIRE IN NEW JERSEY.—A fire broke out in the place in Ocean county, (N. J.) on the 25th ultimo, and raged for four days. It started about three miles north-east of Ferago, and extended to Tom's river, making a sweep of about nine miles in a direct line, and destroying every vestige of timber and vegetation over an area of probably twenty-five square miles.

Four persons were drowned in Newport harbor on Monday by the upsetting of a boat.

THE LAW OF REPRISALS.

It is known to our readers that on Tuesday last a resolution was passed in the Convention of the State of Maryland, now sitting at Annapolis, requesting the President of the United States and the Commandant of the Military Department in which Maryland is included to authorize and levy special reprisals on "known sympathizers with the rebellion, residents in the State," for the purpose of reimbursing "loyal citizens" to the amount of "all losses and spoiliations" sustained by them from the late invasion of Maryland. The resolution to this effect was offered by Mr. SCHLEY, of Frederick, and is in the following terms:

Ordered, That this Convention, representing the people of Maryland, hereby respectfully request the President of the United States and Commandant of the military department in which Maryland is included, as an act of justice and propriety, to assess upon the sympathizers with the rebellion, residents in this State, the total amount of all losses and spoiliations sustained by the loyal citizens of the United States, resident in this State, by reason of the recent rebel raid, to compensate loyal sufferers.

The vote on the adoption of the resolution was taken by yeas and nays as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Goldborough, President; Abbott, Annapolis, Andover, Barron, Carter, Cushing, Daniel, Davis of Washington, Eadie, Eckert, Galloway, Hatch, Hopkins, Hoyer, King, Latta, Markley, McClellan, Mulliken, Murray, Nyman, Parker, Pugh, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Scott, Stirling, Stockbridge, Wickard, and Wooden—33.

NAYS—Messrs. Belt, Chambers, Dall, Davis of Charles, Dennis, Dent, Edelen, Henkle, Holliday, Johnson, Jones of Somerset, Lee, Maco, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, and Smith of Dorchester—17.

We have placed this resolution on record, with the names of those who voted for it, as an instance of the extremities to which partisan bitterness and revenge can stimulate their votaries in a time of revolution, when the passions of men get the better of their reason. It is safe to presume that very few among those who have recorded their votes in favor of this proposition will either approve or defend, as individuals, the policy it contemplates. But in a time of excitement, when public feeling runs high, individuality is destroyed and manly character degenerates until, in the end, the will of the majority may be the mere reflection of the few who are most ready to play on the predominant passion of the hour. He who, under such circumstances, clings to his convictions, as Dr. Lieber has well said in one of his excellent treatises, "is put in ban as unsocial and as an enemy to the people."

It is to precisely such a distemperature of the popular mind that the present proposition owes its conception and the degree of favor it has seemed to find from men sitting in Convention in the name and by the authority of a State. It was presumed by its authors that few would have the courage to oppose it among those whose desire to preserve a reputation for "loyalty" is stronger than their intelligence or their adherence to principle. And the presumption was justified by the result, as but a single member of the Convention, Mr. MACO, of Baltimore county, among those elected as "Unionists," had the perspicacity or the independence to register his vote against this iniquitous suggestion. Let that man be held in honor.

It is charitable to suppose that some who voted for the measure did so from a confusion of ideas with regard to the law of special reprisals, and, as the Convention has asked the President to do what every enlightened citizen knows it is not possible for him to authorize, it may be proper, for the sake of vindicating his conduct from the aspersions to which he may be subjected from refusing compliance with this request, to state that the law of reprisals furnishes a means of redress only between the citizens or subjects of separate States, and does not inhere in the State as against its own citizens or subjects. If one portion of the people of Maryland are to be mulcted in the amount of the damages sustained by another portion in the late invasion of Maryland, it can only be on the theory that this portion of the people are citizens of the so-called Confederate States, with all the rights as well as all the responsibilities of belligerents against the United States; for allegiance and protection are correlative terms.

As between the United States and the so-called Confederate States, certain belligerent rights are, *pendente lite*, recognized by each party to belong to the other. Among these reciprocal rights of war are invasions of territory and levying of requisitions for the support of armies. Our Generals invade the insurgent States and forage on the enemy. The Confederate Generals invade the Loyal States and forage on the enemy. Each in so doing exercises a right of war while the war lasts, however different may be the *de jure* relations of the two belligerents. And the insurgents, in the recent invasion, levied their contributions alike on the "loyal" and on the "sympathizers with the rebellion." They were exercising a right of war against the United States, and in so doing were no respecters of persons, for they regarded every citizen of Maryland as a citizen of the United States. And now comes the Convention and petitions the President of the United States to give a belligerent status in the courts of our military jurisdiction to men whose lawful allegiance to the United States is recognized by the enemy.

We ought perhaps to beg the pardon of our readers for referring to this topic, which some of them may think unworthy of the attention we have bestowed upon it. But as the refusal of the President to take the step to which he is urged by these zealots in Annapolis may subject him to the imputation of being slack to avenge the wrongs of loyal citizens, we have judged it proper to place this question in the light of law and justice, that those whose passions have blinded their judgment may be shown to have no footing on which to bring a railing accusation against Mr. LINCOLN because of his failure to listen to their advice.

If any sympathizers with secession in Maryland aided and abetted the enemy during the late raid, let them be brought to justice, but let not the default of the Government to protect all the law-abiding citizens of Maryland in their rights and

property be made the pretext for despoiling one portion of the people to reimburse the other; and that, too, when all classes of the citizens of the State were treated by the enemy with no discrimination.

We need not say that the impracticability of this scheme of reprisals is only exceeded by its theoretical impossibility. On this point the Boston Daily Advertiser justly says:

"There are many losses for which a pecuniary compensation cannot be made, some for which it cannot be estimated, and many which it would pass any human skill to assess equitably. For all these the Union men of Maryland will have to contrive their own indemnity, and to sustain the burden of the loss themselves. And as the record now stands, it will be the general judgment, we apprehend, that this portion may be assessed as a charge upon them, with hardly less justice than the other is assessed upon their rebellious neighbors. Did not the Union men also do something to justify the invasion, when for year after year they failed to make any sort of provision for local defence? Threatened in the first year of the war, Maryland has been invaded for three years in succession; and to what effect? To provide for such danger can they do nothing? She is not to be held fully accountable for the acts of rebellious children; but what special proof of alacrity and zeal for the defence of her territory do her loyal sons show us? What have they done to escape the mortifying comparison, which must be made, between their readiness for the defensive struggle, and that of the rebel army of Lynchburg and the Federal army? Until some more satisfactory answer can be made to questions like these, that the record now affords, we apprehend that the Unionists of Maryland will find that the country holds them in no slight degree responsible for their own losses."

If there be any sting in the concluding portion of this commentary by our Republican contemporary it is one which might not have been elicited if the proposition in question had never been broached; but people will inquire respecting the "loyal" deeds of men who are so "loyal" in words. It seems to be conceived by some persons that it is lawful for the Administration to adopt any measures for the punishment of men who are "disloyal" in sentiment, however innocent they may be of any overt acts against the peace or safety of the Government. Not only is it supposed that this class of people have no rights which loyal men are bound to respect, but in its conduct towards them the Administration is urged to disregard all considerations of law and to act only at the suggestion of passion and revenge.

A New York journal having recently recommended that all women who do not sympathize with the Union cause should be banished from their homes, the Commercial Advertiser comments on the blind and passionate spirit betrayed by such suggestions in the following just terms:

"That a man who has once conceived such a proposition should not be ashamed to utter it is perhaps not surprising, for we are all given to carousing a chimera when it has once made its way into the mind. But it is surprising that such a proposition should be possibly entertained by a man educated in the American Republic. One is tempted to ask himself what is the use of liberty if those who have breathed its atmosphere from their cradle up bear to it no more intelligent allegiance than this? That Americans, in the middle of the nineteenth century, should be found at the head of a suppressed and unprincipled despotism, the conquest of opinion by force of arms, and the suppression of 'sympathies' by violence and injustice, strikes a cruel blow at the self-esteem of the age in which we live, and puts to rest, with Sir Thomas Browne, whether, after all, any one country be really better or much wiser than another. Certainly one never could have believed, even five years ago, that we should live to hear men of the blood of Chatham and Burke, men of the inheritance of Washington and John Adams, twaddling the sanguinary compasses of a suppressed and unprincipled despotism."

"To say that any man being who inhabits any State of this Republic has a right to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' sacred and inalienable, and not to be interfered with until he or she, by some positive overt act, infers upon the general good of public service, would have seemed, five years ago, really more than a trifle. The assertion rises now apparently to the height of a public duty. It is not pleasant that this should be so, and the fact that so it is assuredly redeems the action of the Cleveland Convention, by which Gen. Freese was nominated for the Presidency, from the imputation of being a mere being taken merely in the interest of a vexed faction and of a disappointed personal ambition. If we really need, as a community, to be taught the alphabet of our political existence, the Cleveland Convention was not held a day too soon. If we have it to say that it is the first condition of our national vigor, whether in peace or in war, that individuals should be left entirely untrammelled in the formation and expression of opinion, then we are, 'of all men, the most miserable,' putting our loyalty in times of mint, anise, and cummin, while we neglect but positively decide to spit upon the weightier matter of the law."

Such is the avidity with which any thing, however repulsive, is received by certain persons in the name of "loyalty," that if a modern Icarus Swift should arise among us with "a modest proposal" for (ating the children of rebels, (similar to that commended to British royalists by the Dean of St. Patrick's in the case of Irish children,) it is not probable that he would find a herd of facile assenters, who, in their eagerness to prove that nothing could revolt the force "loyalty" of their stomachs, would straightway give in their adhesion to the proposition without suspecting its plesantry?

A PROFESSIONAL OPINION.

The British Army and Navy Gazette, after reviewing the facts in the late naval fight, says:

"The palm, therefore, of care and skill must be adjudged to Capt. Winslow and his First Lieutenant; and it must be a matter of pride to these two officers, confessedly among the most practical and best gunnery officers of the Northern States, to have achieved so important a triumph at such a slight cost to their vessel and crew."

STATE QUOTAS.

The quota of the State of New York is 59,318. This is about 2,700 to each Congressional district, taking the average. It is one in seven and six-tenths of the total vote for President in 1860; and nearly one in 44 of the entire population. This ratio would produce, on the population of 480,555 in 1860, the following result: For about one in seven and six-tenths of the voters, (same as in New York State), and one in thirty-one of the population.

The quota of MISSOURI is 26,078, about one in 44 of her population in 1860, and one in 64 of her voters for President.—*Triune*.

FROM THE UPPER MISSOURI.

ST. LOUIS, JULY 21.—The steamer Yellow Stone, from the Upper Missouri, reports that Gen. Sully's Indian expedition was at the mouth of Canonball river building a new fort to be called Fort Rice. Hostile Indians were in force between Fort Rice and Fort Union, and a large number are said to be some miles back of Fort Rice. The officers of the boat say Sully is severely condemned for his inactivity, he keeping his troops, five thousand in number, building fort while he ought to be hunting and dispersing the enemy, and express the opinion that he will not have a collision with the Indians. Father Deschamps, who was on board the Yellow Stone, had two canoes with three hundred Sioux near Fort Berthold, who expressed an anxiety to make peace with the whites. Twenty-six men, Idaho miners, came down on the Yellow Stone with over two hundred thousand dollars in gold each.

ANOTHER INVASION THREATENED.

A BATTLE AT WINCHESTER.

We learn from the Baltimore papers that the military authorities of that city have received information of a battle fought last Sunday at Winchester, (Va.) of which the press generally received no intelligence on account of some interruption of telegraphic communication. The Sun gives the following details of the affair, gathered from official sources:

"About eleven o'clock on Sunday morning, the rebel forces under Gen. Breckinridge and Early attacked the Union forces, under Gen. Crook and Averill, and Col. McAllister and Porter, near Winchester. There was a portion of Gen. Hunter's force in the fight, but Gen. Hunter was not present, being at Harper's Ferry. The battle lasted during the entire day, and when night closed in, the Union commanders, ascertaining that the rebels had received large reinforcements, retired towards Martinsburg and Harper's Ferry. On Monday morning they retired from Martinsburg to Harper's Ferry, after which the rebels occupied Martinsburg."

It was announced that Col. Mulligan, (of Lexington, Mo., formerly) commanding the 1st Cavalry, was killed. He was wounded and seen to fall from his horse, and it was thought was killed. He was an officer well known to this country, and his death will be deplored by many friends. He has for the past year done much service in the Western Virginia along the line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

It was stated that Gen. Averill's forces sustained the heaviest loss, as the rebels made a large force against them during the fight, and succeeded in taking several guns from them, which, however, it is reported, they succeeded in recapturing.

"The actual forces of the enemy are not known, but if another raid is contemplated into Maryland the military authorities are prepared to give them a warm reception. The losses in the fight on Sunday are said to have been quite severe on both sides, but the absence of the official accounts from the General commanding the engagement, all statements from unofficial authorities are withheld."

The Baltimore American gives some additional particulars, as follows:

"Gen. Averill, after his successful encounter with Early's forces, pursued them to the mountains beyond Winchester, where Early made a stand, and after heavy fighting on Saturday and Sunday, the rebels having been in a time largely reinforced, Gen. Averill was compelled to fall back to Harper's Ferry, bringing with him the forces at Bunker Hill, and causing also the evacuation of Martinsburg. The rebels appear to have pursued him in his retreat, and on Monday afternoon again occupied Martinsburg."

"Our forces, according to the best advice we could obtain, are now concentrating at Harper's Ferry, under command of Gen. Hunter, whilst the rebels hold Martinsburg, and our forces are in a large force, this can hardly be possible beyond the strength of Early's and Breckinridge's forces. Their object in returning is doubtless to give time for the safety of their trains of plunder, and to secure the collection of a portion of the crop in the Shenandoah valley. That they may again come into Maryland for more plunder is highly probable, especially if they find the way open to them, as is generally the case in the military management of affairs along the border."

"As to the extent of the disaster to our forces in the fight beyond Winchester, we have no authentic information. The train which left last night for Monday morning for the West and proceeded as far as Sandy Hook returned about half-past seven o'clock the same evening, and all the cars were crowded with passengers. Some of them were Federal officers, who reported that a heavy fight had taken place between the Rebels and the Union forces, and that Hunter had been repulsed. Several pieces of artillery had been captured, and a large number of men of two brigades. It is impossible to ascertain the true state of affairs in that region, but there is no doubt that a serious disaster has occurred to our forces in that region."

"We learn that orders were sent on Monday night to remove the army and medical stores from Frederick as a matter of precaution, and to prepare to evacuate the city in case of the advance of the rebels unchecked in that direction."

Recurring to the subject in its afternoon edition of yesterday, the American says:

"As far as we are able to ascertain this morning, Gen. Averill has not been killed as reported, but was compelled by a greatly superior rebel force to fall back to the Potomac through Martinsburg to Williamsport, Maryland, carrying with him the garrison at that point. Whether the rebels occupied Martinsburg on Monday night is not known, but we have no doubt that they did so. The morning train to Frederick and Washington went out as usual, and a train for Sandy Hook left at 7:45 A. M."

"The suspension of telegraphic operations last night is said to have been caused by the storm of wind blowing down a pole. Gen. Hunter has, however, forbidden all telegraphic communication with Harper's Ferry, and of course we have nothing direct from that vicinity."

We have no later news from the Upper Potomac. The newspapers, the telegraphic lines, and the War Department are all silent as respects operations in that quarter. There are street rumors of further fighting on Tuesday between Martinsburg and Williamsport, but of their reliability we know nothing. They seem to be founded on reports that firing of artillery was heard in that direction on the day mentioned. It is said that the Union troops have not yet abandoned Harper's Ferry, and that they hold Maryland Heights in strong force."

JACKSON AND UNION.

In 1837 President JACKSON wrote from Washington to Mr. Jackson, of New York city, a letter of thanks for the compliment given him by the lady in making her son his namesake. The following passages occur in that old Union man's letter:

"I enclose herewith the usual gift to this namesake that I have bestowed on all my others; it bears the impress of the eagle of his country displayed on all her banners; and, as the child grows in years and in wisdom, I have to deplore that you should be so far from me, that the junction of his childhood, that when he arrives at the years of manhood he will always be found sustaining the eagle of his country from the insult or grasp of a foreign foe, and the still more dangerous enemy the intestine traitor who may engage in the wicked scheme of severing our glorious Union, upon which depends the perpetuity of our happy Government, which will endure so long as our confederated sons last, and no longer. Instill in his mind that our Federal Union must be preserved. To the patriotism of his dear parents I trust this lesson will be early impressed, with all moral virtues, and the love of his country, and his duty to his country."

I beg you to kiss the dear boy for me and present him with my blessing. My prayers will be constantly offered up for him that he may have a long and useful life; that he may be a blessing to his parents in their declining years; and a happy immortality. With my sincere prayers for your and your dear husband's welfare and happiness here and hereafter, and that of your amiable family, I am, very respectfully, your friend, ANDREW JACKSON.

"Mrs. JACKSON, of the city of New York."

THE SPANISH-AMERICAN QUESTION.

From *Gulligan's Messenger* of July 9.

The Spanish Government has sent to Don Mariano Moreno, the Peruvian Consul at Madrid, a plan of arrangement of pending difficulties between the two countries. The following are the conditions which are to serve as the basis of an understanding in question. The draft copy has just been sent to Madrid, and official diplomatic representative who shall solemnly declare:

First, That the Peruvian Government disapproves of the attempts made by the authorities of Callao to incite the Secretary of the Spanish Commissioner, and that those authorities are now dismissed from their functions.

Second, That the Peruvian Government has neither provoked nor taken any part in the attempts directed by the Peruvian against the person of the Spanish commissioner during his journey from Callao to Paita, Panama, and Asquipo, and that it is ready to punish the authors of them.

The Spanish Government on its side will send a representative to Lima for the purpose of demanding that justice shall be done in the affair of Talambó. The Spanish envoy will be furnished with letters of credence similar to those which Mr. Salazar was the bearer, and the commissioner shall be received by the Peruvian Government, immediately after such reception the Chinese Islands will be delivered up to the person appointed by the Peruvian Government. That Government shall name and send a plenipotentiary to Spain in order to conclude on the most equitable basis, and with complete good faith, a treaty between that republic and the Spanish nation similar to those which have been already signed with the other Hispanic American Republics.

A MISSION TO RICHMOND.

Almost simultaneously with the telegraphic announcement that peace negotiations were in progress at Niagara Falls we heard that two gentlemen—Mr. "Edmund Kirke" (James R. Gilmore, formerly of Orange, and now of Boston), and Col. James F. Jaques, of the Seventy-third Illinois volunteers—had just returned to Washington from Richmond, whether they went by consent of the authorities, for some purpose which is not stated. Col. Jaques, who is a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, appears to have acted as principal in this enterprise, and, while having no authority to speak either for the President or Government, seems to have possessed an influence which secured him polite attention and a respectful hearing. With his companion he remained three days at the rebel capital—Saturday, Sunday, and Monday last. It is stated that the Colonel will soon publish an account of this visit. In the mean time we copy what the Washington correspondent of the New York Times says of it:

"Of the real object and end of Col. Jaques' mission, I am requested by himself not now to speak. It is perfectly proper to state, however, that it is in no respect official in its character, and that he had no warranty whatever to enter into any negotiations between this Government and the rebel authorities. Any statement that would convey a different impression would be a misstatement. Col. Jaques belongs to the church of the peace, and he is not at all in sympathy with the rebellion. He believes most heartily in dealing the rebellion with the sword, and he is not at all in sympathy with the peace. He believes that the time will come, and is rapidly coming, when an agency of reconciliation which he believes to be of immediate importance can be used."

"Annotated by this sentiment, he succeeded in so impressing his views upon Mr. Lincoln that the President, without according him the smallest official recognition or authority, was willing, believing his honesty of purpose, that he should try the experiment of a visit to Richmond. Accordingly, he gave him a personal recommendation to Gen. Grant to pass him through the lines, or otherwise forward his views. This aided, Col. Jaques, accompanied by Mr. Edward Kirke, made his way from Gen. Grant's headquarters by the north side of the James river, and, passing the rebel lines, reached the Confederate capital. Here they remained for three days—Saturday, Sunday, and Monday last. While in Richmond, Col. Jaques, at his own request, was placed under guard; but he had the entire freedom of the city, and put up during his visit at the Spottwood House, the 'crack' hotel of Richmond. 'The Colonel, during his three days' stay, visited the various Confederate authorities, as well as the prisons and hospitals in which our captives and wounded are confined. He had two prolonged interviews with President Davis, in his office in the custom-house, and, although the nature and subject matter of the conversation between himself and the rebel President are not proper for present publication, yet it is understood that Col. Jaques met with considerable success in impressing his views upon Mr. Davis. When taking his leave, Davis took the Colonel's hand in both his, shook it warmly, cordially, and, as it were, leaving out of view the present struggle, he had the highest respect for his character and aims."

"The Colonel, while a guest at the Spottwood House, fared sumptuously, being fed on chicken, turkey, mutton, and all the viands of a comfortable hotel, and entertained with fine brandies and cordials. His baggage amounted to more than five hundred dollars in Confederate money, but he found it impossible to induce his entertainers to accept any return for the hospitality he had received. Col. Jaques also had interviews with Mr. Benjamin, Secretary of State, Mr. Ould, Commissioner of Exchange, and other Confederate dignitaries and authorities. The Colonel was permitted to visit the Libby and Belle Isle prisons, and reported that he was agreeably disappointed by the comparative comfort and conditions in which he found our Union captives there confined. The wounded also, though only the more desperate cases, are retained in the hospitals of Richmond, he found as well cared for as could be expected."

"The streets of Richmond are almost deserted. Few others being seen than soldiers, women, peddlers, and beggars. Many of the stores, however, remain open, and there is some business activity. Col. Jaques describes Jeff. Davis as hale and hearty in appearance, his health being much better lately than it had been; and, though he was apparently a little tired and weary of his constitution of the rebel chiefs, he was not at all likely of his giving out during the natural life of the rebellion."

"An extraordinary though Col. Jaques' story, his mission, and all belonging thereto, appear, there can be no doubt whatever of his thorough honesty of purpose, and his quality he appears to be credited both by our own and the rebel authorities. Of his wisdom there may possibly be more question."

LETTER FROM "EDMUND KIRKE."

Mr. JAMES R. GILMORE, better known as "Edmund Kirke," author of "Among the Pines," has deemed it proper to deny, by a publication in the Boston papers, certain inferences which have appeared in their columns respecting his visit to Richmond in company with Col. Jaques. The following passages of Mr. Gilmore's letter, which embrace the material portions of it, will doubtless interest our readers in connection with the foregoing narrative. The letter is dated at Boston on Friday morning last:

"I consider him (Col. Jaques) a brave, true, and patriotic Christian gentleman. He is widely known and esteemed at the college where he was for fourteen years President of Quincy College, Illinois, and as the breaking out of the rebellion was selected by Gov. Yates to raise a three years' regiment. He did so, and with that regiment was in the front of the assault at Fort Donelson; he effected service at Pittsburg Landing; saved our left wing at Perryville; fought as a never seen man fight on the 'shore' (those were Gen. Rosecrans' exact words to me) at Stone River; stood his ground till three horses were shot under him and three-fourths of his men lay dead or wounded about him at Chickamauga